



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,473	08/21/2003	Jamie Wakeam	003797.00616	8478
28319	7590	12/27/2007	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.			SINGH, SATWANT K	
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1100 13th STREET, N.W.			2625	
SUITE 1200			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,473	WAKEAM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Satwant K. Singh	2625		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet.* 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perrone et al. (US 6,603,881).
3. Regarding Claim 1, Perrone et al discloses an application programming interface for analyzing electronic ink (Fig. 1, handwriting recognition system 30), comprising: an analysis context object that maintains document data for a document containing electronic ink content that is hosted by a software application running on a first processing thread (stored electronic pages) (col. 5, lines 52-67), and an ink analyzer object that employs the first thread to make a copy of the document data (Fig. 2, S201, display recorded handwriting data) (col. 5, lines 52-67), provides the copy of the document data to an electronic ink analysis process (Fig. 2, S202-S204, select and decode selected handwriting data and produce recognition results) (col. 5, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-16), and returns control of the first processing thread to the software application (Fig. 2, S208, decode more handwriting data) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

4. Regarding Claim 2, Perrone et al discloses an application programming interface, wherein the ink analyzer object reconciles the results of the analysis process with current document data for the document (Fig. 2, S205, merge recognition results with recognition state) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

5. Regarding Claim 3, Perrone et al discloses an application programming interface, wherein the ink analyzer object makes a second copy of the document data for use in reconciling the results of the analysis process with current document data for the document (Fig. 2, S207, display formatted results) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

6. Regarding Claim 4, Perrone et al discloses an application programming interface, comprising: an ink analyzer object that receives document data for a document containing electronic ink content from a software application hosting the document and running on a first processing thread (stored electronic pages) (col. 5, lines 52-67) employs the first thread to make a copy of the document data (Fig. 2, S201, display recorded handwriting data) (col. 6, lines 1-16), provides the copy of the document data to an electronic ink analysis process (Fig. 2, S202-S204, select and decode selected handwriting data and produce recognition results) (col. 5, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-16), returns control of the first processing thread to the software application (Fig. 2, S208, decode more handwriting data) (col. 6, lines 1-16); and reconciles the results of the analysis process with current document data for the document (Fig. 2, S205, merge recognition results with recognition state) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

7. Regarding Claim 5, Perrone et al discloses a method of analyzing electronic ink, comprising: receiving an analysis context value identifying an analysis context object

(stored electronic pages) (col. 5, lines 52-67), the analysis context object including a data structure containing characteristic data for one or more elements of a document (Fig. 2, S202, selected handwriting data) (col. 5, lines 52-67); and in response to receiving the analysis context value, providing results of an analysis of the analysis context object (Fig. 2, S204, decode selected handwriting data) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

8. Regarding Claim 6, Perrone et al discloses a method, further comprising: receiving a user interface property defining a first processing thread (Fig. 2, S202, selecting desired handwriting data) (col. 5, lines 52-67); in response to receiving the analysis context value, having the identified analysis context object analyzed using a second processing thread (Fig. 2, S203, spatially sort handwriting data) (col. 5, lines 52-67); and in response to receiving the user interface property, providing the results of the analysis of the analysis context object to the first processing thread (Fig. 2, S204, decode selected handwriting data and produce recognition results) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

9. Regarding Claim 7, Perrone et al discloses a method, further comprising: receiving an options property specifying one or more analysis criteria for analyzing the analysis context object (Fig. 6, S601, character or word mode); and in response to receiving the analysis context value, having the identified analysis context object analyzed using the specified analysis criteria (Fig. 6, S603, obtain new recognition results) (col. 6, lines 18-37).

10. Regarding Claim 8, Perrone et al discloses a method, wherein the analysis criteria includes one or more of the group consisting of: enabling text recognition, enabling the use of tables, enabling the use of lists, enabling the use of annotations,

and enabling the use of connectors and containers Fig. 6, S601, character or word mode) (Fig. 6, S603, obtain new recognition results) (col. 6, lines 18-37).

11. Regarding Claim 9, Perrone et al discloses a method, further comprising: in response to receiving the analysis context value, having the identified analysis context object analyzed using a background processing thread (Fig. 6, S607, character or word mode); and allowing changes to the document during analysis of the document (Fig. 6, S608/S609, replace word or character) (col. 6, lines 38-64).

12. Regarding Claim 10, Perrone et al disclose a method, further comprising providing the results of the analysis of the analysis context object by identify a copy of the analysis document object modified to include the results of an analysis of the analysis context object (Fig. 6, S608/609, merge results by replacing word or character) (col. 6, lines 38-64).

13. Regarding Claim 11, Perrone et al discloses a method, wherein providing the results of the analysis of the analysis context object includes, upon completion of analysis of the analysis context object, generating a results event indicating completion of analysis of the analysis context object (Fig. 6, S608/609, new recognition results) (col. 6, lines 38-64).

14. Regarding Claim 12, Perrone et al discloses a method, further comprising: receiving a call to reconcile the results of the analysis of the analysis context object with a current state of the document (Fig. 2, S204, decode handwriting data and produce recognition results); and in response to receiving the call to reconcile the results of the analysis of the analysis context object with a current state of the document, reconciling

the results of the analysis of the analysis context object with the current state of the document (Fig. 2, S205, merger recognition results) (col. 5, lines 1-16).

15. Regarding Claim 13, Perrone et al discloses a method, receiving a call to synchronously analyze at least a portion of the analysis context object (Fig. 12, S1201); in response to receiving the call, analyzing the at least a portion of the analysis context object (Fig. 12, S1202-1203) (processing each line); and prohibiting changes to the document until the at least a portion of the analysis document object has been analyzed (Fig. 12, S1205-1210) (Cannot process next line until all the words in the current line have been processed) (col. 13, lines 54-67, col. 14, lines 15).

16. Regarding Claim 14, Perrone et al discloses a method, receiving an identification of a region of the document (Fig. 12, S1201, obtaining each line); and in response to receiving the identification of the region, analyzing only a portion of the analysis document object corresponding to the identified region of the document (Fig. 12, S1203—1210, process words in line being processed) (col. 13, lines 54-67, col. 14, lines 15).

17. Regarding Claim 15, Perrone et al discloses a method of creating an analysis context object for use in analyzing a document, comprising: receiving a call to create an analysis context object corresponding to a document (Fig. 2, S204, decode selected handwriting data) (col. 5, lines 52-67, col. 6, lines 1-16); and in response to receiving the call to create an analysis context object corresponding to a document, creating an analysis context object that includes a data structure containing characteristic data for

one or more elements of a document (Fig. 6, S601) (character or word mode) (col. 6, lines 18-64).

18. Regarding Claim 16, Perrone et al discloses a method, wherein the analysis context object includes a value defining a portion of the analysis context object to be analyzed during a document analysis process (Fig. 6, S602, current recognition state) (col. 6, lines 18-64).

19. Regarding Claim 17, Perrone et al discloses a method, wherein the analysis context object includes a value defining margins for the document (bounding regions) (col. 12, lines 23-54).

20. Regarding Claim 18, Perrone et al discloses a method, wherein the analysis context object includes an identifier identifying a root node of the data structure (Fig. 6, S601) (character or word mode) (col. 6, lines 18-64).

21. Regarding Claim 19, Perrone et al disclose a method, wherein the analysis context object includes hints for assisting a document analysis process (Fig. 2, S204, recognition results) (col. 6, lines 1-16).

22. Regarding Claim 20, Perrone et al discloses a method, further comprising: receiving a call to provide an identified node of the data structure (Fig. 6, S601) (character or word mode) (col. 6, lines 18-64); and in response to receiving the call to provide an identified node of the data structure, providing the identified node of the data structure (Fig. 6, S608/609) (character or word mode) (col. 6, lines 18-64).

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sampath et al. (US 6,665,425) discloses systems and methods for automated image quality based diagnostics and remediation of document processing systems.

Dodge et al. (US 7,218,779) discloses methods for communication between an application and an ink divider object.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Satwant Singh

sk

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

Thomas D. Lee

THOMAS D. LEE

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :1/22/04, 3/17/04, 5/13/04, 6/25/04, 4/13/06, and 8/10/04.